



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,629	06/22/2001	Vipul Bansal	JP920010121US1	7402

EXAMINER	
AKINTOLA, OLABODE	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3691	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/887,629

Applicant(s)

BANSAL ET AL.

Examiner

Olabode Akintola

Art Unit

3691

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,13-28,31-46 and 49-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10,13-28,31-46 and 49-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/9/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 3691

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-10, 13-28, 31-46 and 49-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pool et al (US 6460020) ("Pool") in view of Woolston (US 6202051) ("Woolston") and further in view of Pathak (US 20020016760) ("Pathak").

Re claims 1, 4-5, 7, 19, 22-23, 25, 37, 40-41 and 43: Pool teaches a method for enabling the online determination of end-to-end costs while negotiating e-commerce transactions comprising: maintaining an updated online database of prices associated with each significant cost element relevant to goods or services involved in completing an e-commerce transaction, wherein said maintaining of said updated online database comprises utilizing an online service that provides information on said cost (col. 4, lines 8-11), wherein said e-commerce transaction comprises an electronic transaction over the Internet between at least one buyer and at least one seller, and wherein said transaction comprises at least one of a purchase, a sale, a trade, an auction, and a reverse auction (abstract, col. 7, lines 6-12): maintaining an updated online database of procedures and rules associated with each activity involved in completing said e-commerce transaction (col. 4, lines 8-11); determining the costs associated with each significant cost element by accessing the price data corresponding to the parameters of said e-commerce transaction (col. 7, lines 6-12); and aggregating all said costs to arrive at a total end-to-end cost for said e-commerce transaction (col. 6, lines 44-67; col. 7, lines 6-12).

Pool does not explicitly teach wherein said cost element comprises commission fees, wherein a winning bid in said auction comprises a highest net payout to the seller after deduction of said

Art Unit: 3691

total end-to-end cost, and wherein a winning offer in said reverse auction comprises a lowest net payout to said buyer after deduction of said total end-to-end cost.

Woolston teaches wherein said cost element comprises commission fees (col. 24, lines 4-10). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pool to factor in commission fees charged for hosting the portal in addition to other applicable taxes and/or fees.

Pathak teaches wherein a winning bid in said auction comprises a highest net payout to the seller after deduction of said total end-to-end cost, and wherein a winning offer in said reverse auction comprises a lowest net payout to said buyer after deduction of said total end-to-end cost (abstract, sections 0090, 0010, 0014, claim 3 (f.iv-f.v and d.), claim 6 (f.iv-f.v and d)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features in order to maximize sellers' (auction) revenue or minimize buyers' (reverse auction) cost.

Re claims 2, 20 and 38: Pool teaches determining a set of e-commerce transactions that should take place and a set of e-commerce transactions that should not take place from amongst various possibilities (col. 8, lines 19-21); and determining prices to be paid by buyers, amounts to be received by sellers and payments to be made to service providers for said transactions that should take place (col. 7, lines 6-12).

Art Unit: 3691

Re claims 3, 21 and 39: Pool teaches wherein said cost elements include shipping and handling costs, other logistics management costs, taxes as well as finance costs (col. 7, lines 6-12, col. 14, line 31 through col. 16).

Re claims 6, 24 and 42: Pool does not explicitly teach method is implemented by an online intermediary providing said facilities as a service either against a fee of commission or free of charge. Woolston teaches wherein said cost element comprises commission fees (col. 24, lines 4-10). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pool to factor in commission fees charged for hosting the portal in addition to other applicable taxes and/or fees.

Re claims 8-10, 13-18, 26-28, 31-36, 44-46 and 49-54: Pool does not explicitly teach an online auction; reverse auction; two-sided matching markets; minimum/maximum qualifying bid.

Pathak teaches an online auction; reverse auction; two-sided matching markets; minimum/maximum qualifying bid (abstract, sections 0090, 0010, 0014, claim 3 (f.iv-f.v and d.), claim 6 (f.iv-f.v and d)). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features in order to maximize sellers' (auction) revenue or minimize buyers' (reverse auction) cost.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Turban, E., ("Auctions and Biddings on the Internet: An Assessment" , Focus Theme, CSU, Long Beach, 1997), teaches online auction of foreclosed real estate (Page 8, col. 1, para. 2) and Listing fees (page 10, col. 1, para. 3).


U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, ("Sale Contract" 1/99) teaches net amount due to Seller (Purchase price less closing help, broker commission and "listing fee") (Page 2, item 5-7).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olabode Akintola whose telephone number is 571-272-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OA



HANI M. KAZIMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER